

New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, Office: 100 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: 100 Nassau Street, New York. Building: No. 100 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

FOREIGN RATES		CANADIAN RATES	
DAILY AND SUNDAY	1.00 One month, 3.00 Six months, 5.00 One year, 10.00	DAILY AND SUNDAY	1.00 One month, 3.00 Six months, 5.00 One year, 10.00
SUNDAY ONLY	0.50 One month, 1.50 Six months, 2.50 One year, 5.00	SUNDAY ONLY	0.50 One month, 1.50 Six months, 2.50 One year, 5.00
DAILY ONLY	0.50 One month, 1.50 Six months, 2.50 One year, 5.00	DAILY ONLY	0.50 One month, 1.50 Six months, 2.50 One year, 5.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Votes for Women.

At the close of the long and bitter debate on suffrage in this state there is precisely one thing that is worth noting. Against the extension of suffrage to women there has been urged no argument, no protest, no warning that has not served its time on every occasion on which it has been proposed to extend the right to vote since man began his long struggle for equality.

From the very beginning, each time there has been a proposal to bestow upon a new fraction of mankind a share in the making of laws, in the choosing of public servants, in the determination of governmental policies, earnest and honest men and selfish and narrow-minded men have uttered prophetic and ponderous words forecasting the ruin of city and of state.

Sometimes it has taken years, generations, centuries, to take a forward step—but always the step has been taken. There has been no rest, no pause, until equal rights are now the portion of men of every rank and condition of life in most countries which call themselves modern and civilized.

Nothing was more logical, more inevitable, than that once all men possessed the ballot there should be agitation and demand that it be extended to all women. If the ballot were a thing of privilege, if only a class or several classes of men could vote, then there was sound reason for excluding not all women, but certain classes, all classes but the favored. But to-day nothing is more generally conceded than that the ballot is a right, not a privilege, and an inherent, not an acquired right of citizens conforming to the law.

On what ground, then, can it be denied to women? Does any man pretend that every man is better qualified to vote than certain women known to him? This is absurd, because it is patent how large a number of the men who do vote are corrupt, ignorant, vicious. Yet no one pretends in this day to exclude the ignorant or can hit upon a method to exclude all the corrupt.

The fact is that the right to vote belongs to women as a right if it belongs to men. If it is a right at all, it is absolutely impossible to limit or circumscribe the right. The effort to do this in the case of men has broken down. The whole course of governmental experience all over the world in recent years has been toward universal suffrage. But on what basis of right can one sex exclude the other, it now being agreed that no class can as such exclude others?

It is not a question of whether all women want to vote. It is enough that some of them do. It is not a question of what women will do with the vote after they get it. No one will pretend they would abuse it as some men do. The whole question comes down to a question of natural right. By what right may men justify their exclusion of the women from the polls save only by that right which is might?

It has all been tried over and over again. You can find in history nothing but a repetition of the struggles of a few to prevent their fellows from sharing in government, power, wealth. All through our modern history the thing goes on. Always it is for the good of the state that the few oppose the many, the rich, the poor, the titled, the common people. Always the same fear for the consequences to the beneficiaries impels the Haves to withhold from the Have Nots. It was not good for the slaves to have liberty; every slaveholder was certain of it. The peasants of France were not fit for liberty; the nobility knew it.

But always the end has been the same. That which belonged of right to all men has in the end been acquired by all men. Privilege has been broken down, exclusive power has been abolished and still nations have lived, men have not destroyed themselves or their countries.

It will not be different in this case. Three years ago the fight for equal suffrage was a joke. Men laughed at the thought who will vote for it to-morrow. All it is necessary to do is to read the frantic denunciations of the opponents of suffrage to see how little of a joke the thing now seems to them. It has passed the stage where men laugh; it will be presently past the stage where they argue against it.

And it all comes back to the single point. No one in a democracy is entitled to privileges not within the reach of all. If one human being has a right to vote all have, under equal conditions. We have made rank, color, wealth, a thousand other things the test of eligibility to vote—and we have discarded them. There remains only the disqualification of sex—and that, too, will be abolished.

cluded from a share in government and power have won. They will win because the thing they are fighting for is denied them, not through justice but through arbitrary force.

A lot of eminently respectable and wholly commendable citizens will go to the polls to-morrow determined to perform a great public duty. They will vote against woman suffrage, as their kind have voted against every other project of progress since the world began. If suffrage is beaten they will be first satisfied at the result and then surprised that it has settled nothing. They will be still more surprised in the future when they see how far from settled the thing really is.

New York State's Opportunity.

The voters of New York State who go to the polls to-morrow really desiring progress in government and real efficiency and economy in state affairs will vote for the new constitution.

This issue far transcends in importance that of any election in recent years. Indeed, submitted together with the question of votes for women, it makes this the most important election in this generation. The question is not whether certain mechanical features of government shall be altered, this way or that. It is whether the people of the State of New York, recognizing that their affairs are in a slough, are willing to unite to lift them out of that slough. It is whether the people, understanding that basic principles, both as to governmental processes and participation in government, are now set at naught, are ready to take a long step in advance and bring them into conformity with present day conditions and contemporary thought.

The state government at present is wasteful; it is inefficient; it is not responsive, in any adequate degree, to the demands of the people. It runs like a watch filled with dust. Selfish interests, political and financial, have tinkered with it until they have made it so confused and complicated that they, the professionals, can get out of it what they want, but the plain citizens, amateurs in the political game always, cannot get what they want. The Governor, who is the "state administration" so far as the people are concerned, is hedged around and handicapped by all sorts of limitations. He may initiate policies which have complete public approval, but he has no power to carry them out. An antagonistic Legislature or an unfriendly department head can prevent it. Thereupon the public visits its indignation for "failure" on the Governor, when the system of government, not he, has failed.

Under the new constitution the Governor will have powers commensurate with the responsibility he must bear. The department system will be made simple and coherent. The Governor may appoint and remove the heads of administrative departments, subject only to confirmation by the Senate in the case of commissions whose members exercise legislative and judicial as well as administrative functions. The Governor will be directly responsible for the state's financial condition. He, an official elected by all the people, will have to prepare and submit a budget for state expenditures, together with an estimate of the state's resources. This will be open for the study of the public, instead of being prepared in secret and passed, as are the Legislature's appropriation bills, without any person's knowing all they contain.

The Legislature, in turn, instead of being deluged under local and special demands so that it has little time for consideration of questions of state-wide import, will be freed from such matters. It will be able to study and deliberate on general laws instead of small fry matters. Cities will be able, under general provisions, to handle their own affairs adequately, instead of being ruled completely from Albany.

All these reforms mean a tightening up of government so that waste diminishes and efficiency is increased. Power goes with responsibility. The government will be so visible, the public servants will be so responsible, that there will be small chance of success for the attacks of "invisible government."

These things are all fine and highly desirable; they outweigh the minor flaws inescapable in any human product constructed as is a state constitution.

Let Liberty Shine.

The patriot who would buy an overcoat of gold leaf for the Goddess of Liberty would no doubt like to see things refurbished and tidied up in and about the nation's gateway. Possibly he has a bronze deer or two flanking the driveway leading to his own front door, and through his efforts to maintain these fresh and bright and new has contracted the habit of noticing the condition of all statutory exposed to the elements. Most of the rest of us would never have thought to view the famous French lighthouse, to give her the name beloved of the late John Bigelow, from this particular mental angle, having neither inherited nor acquired bronze deer or other lawn statutory and with it the obligation of upkeep. Which only goes to prove what the psychologists have been hammering in upon us all these years, that the commonest objects look totally different to different individuals.

But gold leaf would seem hardly as appropriate in this instance, would it, as a coating of nickel? In the first place, since foreign cartoonists have been wont to picture Miss Liberty holding aloft the dollar sign instead of the torch, a coating of gold might be construed as corroboration of their implied charge that our freedom is a matter of dollars, especially as the offer to gild the statue comes from a point near Pittsburgh. It is, of course, true that gilded the old girl would harmonize perfectly with all the radiators in town. But with a nickel surface she would blend beautifully with the bathroom fixtures and, being entirely surrounded by water, what could be more fitting? In any

case, a nickel goddess, possibly symbolizing the jinx, the coin of the humble, would reflect the sun with as great intensity and be more in keeping with our blessed American democracy.

Tirpitz's British Disciples.

A detailed list published in "The Liverpool Post" shows how seriously German traffic with Scandinavia has been hampered of late by the presence of British submarines in the Baltic. The number of vessels lost between October 11 and 23 is given as twenty, and as the name is noted in each case it may be presumed that this is correct.

It is true that the Germans have sometimes sunk as many British vessels in a week, but comparison by number is not enlightening, because as soon as it became apparent that a submarine blockade of British ports was impossible the German commanders fell to destroying everything within their reach, including harmless little fishing vessels. Thus one week last August the aggregate tonnage of twenty vessels sunk amounted to no more than 6,965, showing that in all probability the heroes of the U-boats had been obliged to confine their attention chiefly to travelers. The aggregate tonnage of the twenty vessels sunk in the Baltic is estimated at above 38,000. Twenty more well laden ships were sunk with their cargoes the week before, to say nothing of five transports.

It will be seen, then, that since British submarines have begun to follow the example set by Germany they have proved reasonably efficient. The damage they are doing is more momentous than the damage done by the Germans, for while the Germans could not seriously affect Britain's overseas trade Germany has been at least gravely embarrassed in the only waters where hitherto comparative immunity was assured. Iron ore, so important in the prosecution of her military enterprises, came largely from Sweden, and there were many other goods for supplying which Scandinavia was, if not indispensable, at least convenient. It is conceivable that before long the Germans may have cause to regret the example set by their favorite ogre, the ingenious Tirpitz.

A Good Man for Albany.

The 25th Assembly District has been well and favorably known for the calibre of men whom it has sent to Albany. In Robert McC. Marsh, the Republican candidate for member of Assembly this year, it presents one who would be a worthy successor to the best of them.

Never an officeholder, Mr. Marsh has nevertheless an excellent equipment for the place he seeks. As president of the New York Young Republican Club, as a member of the Citizens Union's committee on legislative affairs, he has given careful and detailed study to legislative questions in general and those affecting this city in particular. Such experience for a new legislator is rare. It gives him an advantage the ordinary first year man cannot hope to have and makes him, therefore, an exceedingly valuable representative for his district.

By character, by experience, by ability, Mr. Marsh deserves the vote not only of Republicans, but of voters politically independent who want well qualified men in Albany and men standing for clean politics and against machine rule.

A Supreme Court justice rules that a bachelor's testimony that he never kissed a woman or was kissed by one was upheld by the weight of evidence. But even Gladstone Dewie fell.

Great battle in Champagne won by French—headline.

With grape shot?

King George, fortunately, is doing better in bed than on horseback.

Yale, like Russia, is beaten but not defeated.

The Prosecutor Judicial.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Expressed in a few words, the following is a reason for voting for Mr. Perkins as District Attorney, which may seem persuasive to many, but which I have not urged in the voluminous literature with which this city has been deluged during the campaign now closing:

1. The office of District Attorney is a judicial office.

Every counsel of any standing in the city will stand for the proposition that it requires higher judicial qualities than that of any judge.

2. The great body of the citizens are committed to the policy of continuing judicial officers in power where they have served the country well for a period of years, and of re-electing them when they are candidates to succeed themselves.

This commitment has been made by both political parties.

3. The failure to re-elect an efficient judge, after all, causes little change as compared with the failure to re-elect an efficient District Attorney, because the latter disarranges a large office force who also exercise judicial powers.

This is especially so if the new incumbent belongs to a party or the faction of a party which believes that "to the victor belong the spoils."

Hence, many of my friends who are Democrats are going to support, in the coming election, a number of candidates for judicial office who are Republicans, and among them we include the present Republican District Attorney, J. ASPINWALL HODGE.

New York, Oct. 29, 1915.

American War Horses.

(From The Dundee Advertiser.)

According to the figures published by the United States Department of Agriculture, it is estimated that up to the beginning of September representatives of the Allies had bought in America more than 425,000 horses—or rather draft animals, as many males are included in the total. This seems a considerable number, but it does not by any means exhaust the supply, there being approximately 2,000,000 horses and 4,000,000 mules in the country. Most of the purchases have been brought from the ranches to depots near New York and other large cities, where they would be given a few days' rest, and then be shipped off to England or France, about 1,000 at a time.

DEMOCRACY NEEDS SUFFRAGE

Women Should Be Obligated to Assume Responsibility of Voting.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A conspicuous advertisement in the subway these days tenders the information that 90 per cent of women do not want the vote. A proposition equally accessible to proof is that 90 per cent of children do not want to go to school.

If the first statement is true, what does it mean? What can it mean except that one-half of the population has no interest in the welfare of our country, for interest inevitably implies a desire for some personal participation? What becomes, then, of our idealized democracy? For in addition to the half of its components, who, according to the advertisement, "do not care," there is a considerable proportion who cannot care.

Institutions of detention, such as jails, almshouses, lunatic and inebriate asylums and homes for epileptic and feeble-minded contain a substantial percentage of the population. Such inmates are too anti-social or too extraneous to take a wise interest even in themselves. And it might be hazarded that for every such charge to the state there are three or four who, while they wear the clothes of liberty, are mentally unfit to contribute to the state. With one-half of the population, then, not voting because they do not want to, and another considerable percentage not voting by reason of a demonstrated mental deficiency, government by the people becomes not what Montesquieu dreamed of, but oligarchical.

Democracy's escape from this dilemma would seem to lie in compelling or inducing those who can, even though they do not want to, to take an intelligent interest in affairs, just as a wise government makes its children go to school even if they do not want to. The obstacle to woman's advancement to political responsibility is, apparently, no longer a question of unfitness. What progressive women have done in the last five years in the way of organization and scientific presentation of their claims for capacity in co-operative service has smothered the cry that femininity is inconsistent with an intelligence that constructs. The cry that they cannot have now become a complaint that they do not want to. If this is true, it is high time that they should be led from their lethargy and induced, through the interests of participation, to contribute to the ideals of democracy.

PEARCE BAILEY.

New York, Oct. 29, 1915.

Woman and War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I ask for enlightenment on the following questions?

First—Is not the general indictment you bring against the British rulers in your editorial of a few days ago, under the heading "The Sham," an indictment also against a democratic form of government? In other words, is it reasonable to assume that the English people and public press, in times of peace, would have sustained and upheld their rulers in making adequate preparation for such a war as she is now engaged in, in defiance of her treaty stipulations and national safety?

Second—Are the facts you marshal in such a masterly manner in the same editorial entirely logical with your process of reasoning in other issues of your great journal on the question of "woman suffrage?"

I do not wish to be understood as bringing into question the patriotism of your own and I concede that her moral influence on the liquor traffic has ever been on the right side. But we are within striking distance of millions of armed men engaged in mortal conflict, and when final victory has been won by one or the other of the contending parties who will venture an opinion as to the state of mind of the victorious host or the future policy of their rulers?

And are we sure that President Wilson will be able to carry through his ideas for "preparation," in view of our vast interior population, with Bryan and his lieutenants in open revolt and active in attempting to cloud the issue and mislead his great following? In view of these facts is it the part of prudence and wisdom to revolutionize the American electorate at the present time?

And knowing woman's instinctive horror of war and her great love and tender concern for her household, shall we give her a public voice and an uncertain private vote on questions that are seen to stimulate the passions and provoke the most acrimonious debates of any question in our recent public life? Would not this great responsibility and further care prove an added burden to her already heavy load and tend to cloud her judgment, weaken her constancy of purpose and excite and perplex her effeminate nature to the detriment of the great work she is at present doing so grandly in the home, the Church and the public school?

C. H. BUTLER.

Johnstown, N. Y., Oct. 27, 1915.

From Honolulu.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: While at the San Francisco Exposition I was tempted, like many others, to extend my trip 2,100 miles into the Pacific to the Hawaiian Islands, and found that here, as elsewhere throughout my travels, there was an intelligent interest in the City of New York.

A Honolulu resident called my attention to Senator Bennett's article in the October "Strand Magazine," "Why America's Greatest City Is a Bankrupt," and there is surprise that a city administration pledged to economy should have outstripped Tammany in extravagance, especially at the statement that it "has added, since March 1, 1914, over six hundred employees to the payroll, at an annual cost of a million dollars."

The New York City exhibit at the fair aroused much favorable comment, while the building in which it is housed has been adversely criticised for its barnlike appearance.

The fair itself is a splendid tribute to the wonderful enterprise of San Francisco, which, with half a million population and but a few years removed from a disastrous earthquake and fire, has been able to initiate and carry through, successfully, the great exposition of the arts and industries of the world.

In Honolulu the Japanese fair outnumber all other nationalities and appear to be the most wideawake and progressive. You find them in the streets, in the trolley cars, everywhere in the city, as well as adjacent country. They are laborers, cooks, waiters, farmers, storekeepers, architects, builders, school teachers—and good at all trades and professions. Their men appear on the streets in native costume, carrying their babies on their backs, and their children are among the brightest in the public schools. Chinese and Portuguese are also much in evidence.

To a visitor the climate appears ideal—beautiful sunshine, luxuriant palms, ferns and flowers, and cool breezes at night. Every phase of nature is beautiful in color and form. But a number of Americans I have talked to say they lose their energy and ambition after a few years' residence.

Uncle Sam has about 10,000 soldiers here, and has in this "mid-Pacific paradise" a charming territory of great possibilities, commercially and strategically.

ALBERT E. DAVIS.

Honolulu, T. H., Oct. 12, 1915.

ONE OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION'S RECOMMENDATIONS.



THE NEW CONSTITUTION

Its Value as a Contribution to Political Progress and Better Government Emphasized by Contributors with a Variety of Points of View.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The page advertisement of Mr. George W. Perkins arguing against the new constitution will appeal to the voters by its size, its typographical skill and the honored name of its author, rather than by any reasons which it contains. The new constitution strikes a serious blow against four great tendencies in the American Republic.

1. Against the invisible government, by making the Chief Executive responsible to the people for the public administration of state affairs, as the President is responsible to the people for the public administration of national affairs.

2. Against public extravagance, by making it the duty of one man elected by all the people to present publicly a budget to the Legislature which is now presented by three or four men, names unknown, who are elected by a small number of the voters.

3. Against the law's delays, which are a fruitful source of practical injustice. To prevent these delays the new constitution provides that instead of referees, which are now appointed by the courts and paid by fees, which makes them interested to prolong litigation, there may be salaried commissioners vested with the same powers and similarly appointed, but paid by salaries, which will make them interested to expedite litigation. The new constitution also reduces the number of possible appeals.

4. Against the bureaucratic tendencies in American government, by a radical increase of local self-government both in the cities and in the counties.

The fact that under the new constitution governmental control of the markets will be by a bureau, not by a department, and that the governmental control of public property will be, as is the public control of our transportation system, by a commission of several members instead of by a single commissioner, will hardly seem, even to those who agree with Mr. Perkins in thinking these mistakes, sufficient objections to outweigh the four great benefits which this constitution, if adopted, will confer upon the people of the state.

Mr. Perkins makes much of the fact that the constitution is to be voted upon as a whole, not in separate sections. When we go to the polls on Tuesday morning we voters will have, in addition to a ticket giving us the names of candidates to be voted for, a ticket or tickets calling on us to pass judgment upon five constitutional amendments. These will present problems quite complicated enough. Most of us voters, who are not professional politicians, would not thank the Constitutional Convention for requiring us to cast a ballot involving our decision on over twenty separate questions.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

Cornwall-on-Hudson, Oct. 29, 1915.

The Labor Attitude.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The labor organizations are angry, and justly so, at the rejection by the Constitutional Convention of their demands, and propose, as an act of vengeance, to defeat the entire constitution. Resolutions by the State Workmen's Federation and associated bodies call upon organized labor to vote against the proposed constitution. Many members of the trades unions, however, feel that such drastic action would be unwise, in view of the facts that the new constitution is a decided advance upon the old, and that the way is opened by the increased power given to the Legislature to secure speedily the adoption of such amendments as labor seeks to incorporate in the state constitution.

It is noteworthy that the constitution is being attacked at various points by those whose personal interests are involved; it is too radical for the reactionary and conservative elements represented by Barnes and Senator Brown; it is not radical enough for the labor interests. It is a widely expressed opinion that the convention, facing many diverse interests, has reached a fair basis of compromise and has evolved a simplified, orderly and responsible form of government for the state.

The advances made for labor may be briefly summed up:

First—Constitutional recognition of the functions of the State Labor Department.

Second—The constitution puts beyond

question the powers of the Legislature to extend workmen's compensation to occupational diseases.

Third—The Legislature is to have power to prohibit manufacturing in tenement houses.

Fourth—An increase in salary to members of the Legislature, so that workingmen can afford to be nominated and serve independently.

Fifth—The retention of an elective judiciary, responsible only to the people.

Sixth—The Governor's power to send emergency messages is abolished.

With a careful study of the constitution, it will be found that at least one round in the ladder of progress may be climbed, and rather than for mere vengeance, to drop back, it would be wise to accept the good that is presented, and continue to work for further and greater benefits.

R. M. CAMPBELL.

(Member of Typographical Union No. 6.)

Brooklyn, Oct. 29, 1915.

Taxation Aimed at New York City.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The proposition for a state income tax as a method of securing additional revenues for city and state purposes, serves to direct attention to the growing tendency toward heavier tax burdens on the residents of this city.

This does not apply only to state taxation, but also to the question of Federal revenues. The sentiment in Congress which led to the adoption of the tax on corporations and the income tax was strengthened by the knowledge that these would be largely borne by the great manufacturing and commercial cities, of which New York is easily first.

An analysis of the corporation tax and income tax returns shows that the anticipations of their advocates have been fulfilled, and that this city is paying a very large percentage of the total amount collected from these sources. And, in the opinion of careful observers of the Congressional mind, we are only at the beginning of further tax impositions on the manufacturing, commercial and financial interests of the country, of which New York will be called upon to pay its proportionately heavy share.

The popular demand for increased appropriations for national preparedness has been met with the suggestion by Senators and Representatives from the Southern and Western states that the revenues for this purpose be secured by increasing the rate of the Federal income tax, while the Anti-Saloon League, which is vigorously prosecuting its campaign for national prohibition, under which there would be an immediate loss of \$300,000,000 annual revenue, has in its official organ declared for a heavy Federal inheritance tax as one method of raising this immense amount, now voluntarily paid by the consumers of alcoholic beverages.

Do the mercantile, manufacturing and commercial interests of New York realize the extent of the burdens that are likely to be imposed on them by Federal tax laws? Are they willing to contribute in an ever-increasing ratio toward meeting the expenses of the national government? If not, it is high time that they should take action to oppose all proposals for taxation that are aimed at the productive capital and industry of this city.

New York, Oct. 16, 1915.

A Democrat for Perkins.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I hope no sensible man will be misled by the posters in the subway and the noisy shoutings for Mr. Moss.

All of these things are paid for by Tammany Hall in an effort to split the anti-Tammany vote.

If Tammany secures control of the District Attorney's office the gangsters, the thugs and the underworld will come swarming back to New York.

I know two socialists who will vote for Perkins, to keep the office out of the Tiger's clutch.

I am an enrolled Democrat, but I am urging all my Democratic friends to vote for Perkins, because if Tammany had the District Attorney it would hurt the Democratic party in the whole country.

JAMES SCULLY.

New York, Oct. 27, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It happens to have been my duty during the last five years to watch the progress of efforts toward charter revision in numerous American cities. These efforts are miniatures of our present fight for the revised constitution, and they exhibit the following definite stages in the working of the American mind:

The simpler and modernized proposed charter is presented to the people, and is obviously a wholesale improvement on the old charter, which is, by comparison, antiquated and encrusted with abuses. There is a lull before the storm. Certain persons opposed by temperament, class or politics to the crowd that wrote the revised charter scan it eagerly for talking points wherewith to damn it. They always find them—no difficulty about that. Charging the charter committee with an insidious malevolence quite unknown except in the hearts of melodramatic villains, they come with a fiery broadside: "Behold, there is a flyspeck in Section 53! Suppose now we had a Mayor some time in league with the gas company," etc. (One of the beauties of any constructive instrument such as a constitution or a charter is the fact that you can spin a perfectly wonderful "suppose" out of every line of it.)

Fortwith, the attention of the town focuses on Section 53, and discussion rages as to whether there is really a flyspeck there or not. If the existence of a flyspeck be proven, the new charter is in grave peril, for it never seems to occur to anybody to remark that there are palpable flyspecks all over the old charter. The opposition never is compelled to finish its argument and claim that the old instrument is superior to the new. The larger view, however, prevails in the end. If the time for discussion is not too short.

In recent days I have heard about twenty men, whose motives I cannot question and whose judgment I usually value, shouting about flyspecks in the new constitution—and every one of them has found a different flyspeck! Some of them, in fact, have a new one each time I meet them.

The new constitution is, of course, disappointing to radicals, who are making the mistake of not realizing that their quarrel is really with the people of New York State, especially the upstate voters, who are very conservative.

Practical reformers have no easy optimism. If this revision is defeated, their plan will be to avoid duplicating the expense of laboriously educating a new set of delegates and to begin heavily-headedly a process of piecemeal legislative amendment on the basis of the wealth of information which this convention collected in its committee hearings.

It was a conservative convention. They had no social programme, no economic programme. They stuck to the hard, stupid, technical details of governmental organization. But within that refractory field they did do a good job. They set up for the people a strong, well knit government—a better instrument of democracy than is possessed by any state in the Union. They did it in the name of mere efficiency and economy—dull, uninspiring, unimpassioned watchwords! Alas! how many voters fall to see that for the electorate to obtain a sharper weapon in itself a pregnant triumph for democracy!

RICHARD S. CHILDS.

New York, Oct. 29, 1915.

Are We Prussianized?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your leading editorial of October 26, under the heading "Just Another Incident," you say, among other things, regarding the recently disclosed bomb plots of German agents: "Your modern Prussian-German understands nothing but force. All else is to him a confession of cowardice and a proof of degeneracy. He sees in patience only timidity, and in tolerance only terror."

I would be interested to know whether The Tribune subscribes to this sentiment. In reading your editorials of the last eight months it has been my impression that your attitude is